

Yeh, Alice

From: Yeh, Alice
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 10:19 AM
To: Basso, Ray; Vaughn, Stephanie
Subject: CAG meeting discussion on RM10.9

Yesterday's CAG Executive meeting was uneventful, except for the beginning discussion on RM10.9.

David started reporting that we are working well with the CPG on RM10.9 issues, when Ella Filippone cut in to say that things are not going so well from her point of view.

She said that the CPG is unwilling to negotiate with her – she has asked that the total mass of contaminated sediments be removed in front of her property. If that can't be done, she has asked that after the top layer is removed, if high levels of contamination are found just underneath, that the CPG commit to digging deeper.

I said that the scope of the project is set in the AOC, so the CPG is just following the AOC. The CPG is negotiating implementation details and safety issues with Lyndhurst, not scope of dredging.

So then Ella said that she had also not gotten satisfactory answers on how the CPG was going to protect the river from dioxins moving up and down the river after they are exposed from the dredging at RM10.9. I said that that was something they should be able to talk to her about.

Ella made the statement that if the CPG had started talking to her earlier in the process, then she would not be so unhappy now. She claimed that the CPG did not start talking to her until she raised the fact that she is an adjacent property owner at a public meeting in Lyndhurst.

Ella said that the CPG asked her to sign a release, which she has not yet done. She also said that she has not signed off on any permits yet. It was unclear what she meant (Janine did not know).

Note that the CAG asked whether there are any documents coming out between now and Aug 1 that might need their review. I said probably not, but please correct me if I'm wrong.

Also, David committed EPA to taking notes during the June 5 public meeting in Lyndhurst, to give the CAG some idea of the issues raised by the public. He said he had extra staff who would be there to do this.

On FFS issues:

- CAG asked for briefings on modeling and risk assessment results when they are ready.
- CAG asked for summary of what will be in the FFS vs. what will not be in the FFS (e.g., FFS will not specify where the upland processing facility will be).
- CAG asked for a list of key differences between EPA and CPG modeling approaches.
- Note that in response to questions, I discussed two peer review comments: infilling and wind effects in Newark Bay.
- CAG formed 2 subcommittees to focus on the FFS: technical and outreach.

I will be working on those FFS issues.